

Exhibit 21

DOCKET NUMBERS 05-15223 and 05-15347

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT

05 AUG 19 PM 1:47

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

FILED _____
DOCKETED _____
DATE _____ INITIAL _____

FLEMING COMPANIES, INC.,

DEFENDANT, APPELLANT, AND CROSS-APPELLEE,
v.

WAYNE BERRY,

PLAINTIFF, APPELLEE AND CROSS-APPELLANT

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

**REPLY AND RESPONSE BRIEF OF APPELLANT FLEMING
COMPANIES, INC. (THIRD BRIEF ON CROSS-APPEAL)**

Eric C. Liebeler (CA SBN: 149504)
Damian D. Capozzola (CA SBN: 186412)
R. Olivia Samad (CA SBN: 228611)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
777 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, California 90017
(213) 680-8400 telephone
(213) 680-8500 facsimile
eliebeler@kirkland.com

Lex R. Smith (HI SBN 3485-0)
Suite 2600, First Hawaiian Center
999 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
(808) 539-8700 telephone
(808) 539-8799 facsimile
lrs@ksglaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant - Appellant Fleming Companies, Inc.

prohibiting modifications.⁸ The license which Berry negotiated and accepted allowed Fleming to change the system and modify reports that came out of it.⁹ Prior to the transition from API to Fleming, the system had frequently been modified, and it was Fleming's understanding that the license it had negotiated allowed for continued changes as may be necessary to serve Fleming's internal business purposes.¹⁰

Against this background, Fleming had no actual knowledge that it was infringing, and thus could not have continued to infringe in the face of that knowledge, which is what the law requires for willfulness. *Columbia Pictures Television v. Krypton Broad. Of Birmingham, Inc.*, 106 F.3d 284, 293 (9th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds by *Feltner v. Columbia Pictures Television, Inc.*, 523 U.S. 340 (1998); *see also Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp.*, 982 F.2d 1400, 1406 (9th Cir. 1993) (plaintiff must present sufficient evidence to establish knowledge sufficient to show a deliberate intent). And for all of the same reasons, it was error to instruct the jury on willfulness. Jury instructions must be

formulated so that they fairly and adequately cover the issues presented, and must be based on evidence in the record. *White v. Ford Motor Co.*, 312 F.3d 998, 1012

⁸ E 022 (October 29, 1999 proposal, at page 2 of 5, § 2(d)).

⁹ E 034-035 (November 26, 1999 license)

¹⁰ Brf. at pp. 10-12; E 179-181 (Stussi's Testimony, March 3, 2003, at 104:16-104:22; 105:8-105:21; 106:1-106:8, CR 201).